8100
LOSi

BLM LIBRARY
88055937

Lower Salmon River Cultural Resource Management Plan

1986 Annual Report

Bureau of Land Management
Coeur d'Alene District
Cottonwood Resource Area

F
572
.S3
S57
1987

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

PUBLICATIONS DISPOSITION REMINDER

☐ Dispose of after circulating

☑ Retain in file for Perma. years

☐ Other disposition *(specify)*

PERSON AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE DISPOSITION

Date 3/13/81	Initial R.J.R.G.

GPO 781-061 Form 1271–4 (July 1973)

RECEIVED
UTAH STATE OFFICE
1987 MAR -5 AM 10:00
DEPT. OF INTERIOR
BUR. OF LAND MGMT.

#35073046

88055937

F
572
.S3
S57
1987

BLM LIBRARY
BLDG 50, ST-150A
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 25047
DENVER, COLORADO 80225

1986 ANNUAL REPORT

LOWER SALMON RIVER

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Prepared by

David A. Sisson

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

Coeur d'Alene District

Summary of the FY 1986 Accomplishments

The Lower Salmon River Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) continued to be implemented according to the implementation schedule outlined in the CRMP and the CRMP FY84 Annual Report.

The three-year review of the CRMP was completed in April, 1986. The review team consisted of Jon Idso, BLM Shoshone District Manager; David Brunner, BLM Boise District Manager; Richard Hanes, BLM Oregon State Office Archeologist; Tom Green, Idaho Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer; and Dr. Roderick Sprague, Director of the Alfred Bowers Laboratory of Anthropology, University of Idaho. Dan Hutchison, Idaho State Office Archeologist, acted as the facilitator. Other personnel that attended the reveiw that contributed input were Wayne Zinne, BLM Coeur d'Alene District Manager; Lanny Wilson, BLM Cottonwood Resource Area Manager; and David Sisson, BLM Coeur d'Alene District Archeologist.

The team recommended the following actions: adjust the site monitoring schedule; develop a cultural resource public awareness program; and continue to designate the cultural sites for future scientific use. All of the recommendations were adopted. The monitoring schedule was changed to a six year cycle rather than the current three year cycle. This change will allow more time to be spent monitoring and documenting sites receiving greater impacts. A cultural resource public awareness plan has been prepared. The objectives of the plan are to increase public awareness, alleviate resource damage and encourage public involvement and support for cultural resources. Various audiences, messages and mediums have been identified to meet the plan objectives. Copies of the plan can be obtained by contacting the Coeur d'Alene District. The final recommendation has also been adopted and the cultural sites will continue to be designated for future scientific use.

The area from Hammer Creek to the Confluence (Section B) was officially listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The area has been designated the Lower Salmon River Archeological District.

In February, 1986, the Cottonwood Resource Area was presented the Orchid Award from the Idaho State Historic Preservation Society. The award was presented for the Lower Salmon River Cultural Resource Management Plan's outstanding contribution to historic preservation in Idaho.

Curation of recovered artifacts from the management area continued in 1986. A contract with the University of Idaho, Laboratory of Anthropology was initiated to determine what collections may already exist in their facilities. Collections stored at the BLM, Cottonwood Resource Area were also submitted for curation at the Laboratory of Anthropology.

The high flows of the Salmon River tested the Lone Pine Bar Site stabilization project in FY86. The high water reached the base of the third log on the three-tiered log revetment. The log wall was very successful and held the high water from reaching the exposed bank. Some minor natural erosion of the bank occurred later, which was expected. The high flows of the Salmon River would have had a severe impact on the site if the revetment project had not been completed.

The monitoring program was completed as scheduled. Monitoring involved the use of those methods outlined in the CRMP which included photographs of the entire site as well as close-up photo documentation of eroding banks, etc. Measurements of changes as well as estimates of changes were completed. A total of 146 different sites were examined, some of which were examined more than once. Of the 146 sites examined, 34 were noted with impacts from previously unrecorded sources of deterioration or were continuing to be noticeably impacted by previously recorded sources of deterioration.

A summary of those sites with noticeable new or continuing impacts are indicated in Table 1. A summary of the results of the entire monitoring program is presented in the next section of this report.

The various sources of deterioration impacting cultural sites are indicated in Table 1 and are shown as continuing to impact cultural sites or are newly impacting a cultural site. Definitions of these various sources of deterioration are included in the CRMP but flood deposition and the discrete actions involved in recreation use have been further delineated in the FY 1983 Annual Report.

Thirty-four sites of the 146 examined were observed with having noticeable new or continued sources of deterioration. Of the 34 sites, livestock impacted 21 percent of the sites; surface erosion 18 percent; bank erosion 21 percent; flood deposition 15 percent; other sources 3 percent and total recreation use 62 percent. The other sources category included tree improvement and natural deterioration. Bank and surface erosion, although not impacting the greatest number of sites, is probably inflicting greater amounts of damage. Recreation use and livestock use are impacting the greatest number of sites to varying degrees.

Of the total 146 sites examined, 5 percent were impacted by livestock; 4 percent by surface erosion; 5 percent by bank erosion; 3 percent by flood deposition; 1 percent by other sources; and 14 percent by recreation use.

The peak instanteneous flow of the Salmon River was above average in 1986. Therefore, greater impacts were attributed to surface erosion and bank erosion. Damage from recreation use

Table 1
Cultural Sites With Noticeable Continued or New Sources of Deterioration

						Recreation Use						
									Latrines			
Site Number	Live-stock	Bank Erosion	Surface Erosion	Flood Depo-sition	Other Sources	Displaced Artifacts	Vandalism	Trail Use	On-Site	Near-Site	Recreation Facilities	Other
10IH58					C - Timber Improvement							
10IH73							N					
10IH388	C	C	C									
10IH397		N					N				C	
10IH402	C											
10IH724							N				C - Firerings	
10IH750				C					C			
10IH766								C				
10IH779		C		C								
10IH780	C	C						C				
10IH782								N				N - Human waste disposal - no surface disturbance.
10IH791		N										
10IH796	C							C				C - Tramping by people viewing pictographs.
10IH1160	C	C	C									
10IH1161		C										N - Human waste disposal - no surface disturbance.
10IH1163			C									
10IH1180										C		
10IH1181								C				

Table 1 (Continued)

Cultural Sites With Noticeable Continued or New Sources of Deterioration

						Recreation Use						
									Latrines			
Site Number	Live-stock	Bank Erosion	Surface Erosion	Flood Depo-sition	Other Sources	Displaced Artifacts	Vandalism	Trail Use	On-Site	Near-Site	Recreation Facilities	Other
10IH1186					C - Natural Deterioration			N				
10IH1190							N					
10IH1222								C				
10IH1229												N - Firering
10IH1232												N - Firering
10IH1238								N				
10IH1239								C	C	C		
10IH1261				N								
10IH1265												N - Firering
10IH1269			C									
10IH1301				N			N					
10IH1314											N - ORV use N - Firering	
10LE47	C		C					C				
10NP113	C											
10NP123			C									
10NP229				N								

C - Continued impact from previously recorded source of deterioration.
N - Impacts resulting from a previously unreported source of deterioration.

was similar to that in 1985. Recreation use increased in 1985 but there was not a substantial increase in damage resulting from recreation use. Many of the cultural sites impacted from recreation use in previous years continued to be impacted.

Site-Specific Monitoring Results and Recommendations

Results of the FY86 site-specific monitoring are summarized as well as recommendations for future work. Not all management actions can be immediately implemented. Some actions will be planned for FY88 and are briefly outlined in the next section of this report. Other management actions that cannot be funded in FY88 will be planned for out-years depending upon results of the monitoring program in the previous years.

This summary is organized by site number and then a summary of FY86 monitoring (a) and recommendations for future work (b).

10-IH-57

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-58

a) No major change in condition. The tree orchard continues to impact the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-60

a) No significant change in condition. Vegetation cover is heavy.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-73

a) The antiquities sign has been destroyed and the post damaged. No other impacts were noted on the site.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-89

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-387

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-388

a) The high water has removed a lot of the sand from the exposed high bank. This has exposed the area to continued natural weathering, surface erosion and livestock impacts.

b) Monitor once every year. If the site does not stabilize, then develop a site evaluation and protection plan.

10-IH-389

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-396

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-397

a) The high water exposed a previously buried area of historic and prehistoric artifacts. This exposed area was later vandalized. Vehicle use also continues to damage the site.

b) Continue to monitor twice a year. The area should be covered with a layer of rock to prevent further erosion, vandalism and impacts from vehicles. This action should be completed as soon as possible.

10-IH-398

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-399

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-401

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-402

a) No major change in condition. The rockshelter continues to be used by livestock.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-403

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-417

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-429

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-724

a) The project post has been destroyed. The post was pulled out of the ground and burned in a fire. The post was not salvagable. The cultural site was not seriously damaged.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-725

a) No change in condition.

b. Monitor once every year.

10-IH-750

a) The high runoff covered one of the structures and human waste was deposited inside the same structure.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-760

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-761

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-766

a) Recreation trails have formed as usual.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-770

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-775

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-776

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-778

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-779

a) The high water created some minor impacts to the site. Natural erosion continues to impact the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-780

a) The high water impacted the site, exposing more artifacts. Bank erosion, livestock use and recreation use continue to impact the site.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-782

a) Well used recreation trails have formed around the site. One trail has downcut over the edge of the terrace. Also, human waste was deposited in the structure.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-783

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-787

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-788

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-789

a) No major change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-791

a) The high water increased erosion on an exposed bank.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-792

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-793

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-794

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-796

a) Livestock and people continue to trample around the base of the rockshelter. Recreation trails have formed as usual.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-797

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-889

a) During the spring of 1986 someone has moved the old headstone on the grave and placed it at the foot of the grave. A new (modern) headstone has been placed at the head of the grave.

b) Monitor once every year. Continue efforts to locate the individuals who replaced the headstone.

10-IH-1053

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1054

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1160

a) The site continues to be impacted by livestock, surface erosion and bank erosion. Recreation use was noted but it did not impact the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1161

a) Recreation use was noted in the structure (human waste disposal) but had a minor impact. Also, the intermittent drainage that runs through the middle of the structure has slightly increased erosion.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1162

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1163

a) The site has stabilized since the log revetment project was completed. There has been some minor natural deterioration of the bank. The high flows of the Salmon River would have had a severe impact on the site if the revetment project had not been completed.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-1165

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1180

a) No change in condition. Recreation use continues.

b) Monitor once every year. Record the rock structure in more detail.

10-IH-1181

a) A well formed recreation trail leads to the site. No impacts to the site were noted.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1182

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1183

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1186

a) Natural deterioration has caused the framed structure to weaken and lean into a tree. A recreation trail leading to the site has also developed.

b) Monitor once every year. A detailed inventory of artifacts may need to be completed if recreation use is going to increase.

10-IH-1189

a) No major change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1190

a) A glass artifact recorded in 1985 on the site was found shattered on the ground. The artifact was removed from its original location and broken in a different area. Evidently it was moved by recreationists.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1191

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1192

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1193

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1194

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1195

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1196

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1197

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1198

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1200

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1201

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1205

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1208

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1209

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1210

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1211

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1212

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1213

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1214

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1215

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1216

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1217

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1220

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1221

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1222

a) No change in condition. The recreation trail still leads to the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1223

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1224

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1225

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1226

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1227

a) No change in condition. Several diagnostic artifacts were located that had been previously unobserved.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-1228

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1229

a) A recent campfire has been built in the bottom of the depression.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-1231

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1232

a) A firering was noted on the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1233

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1238

a) No change in condition. Several recreation trails were noted on the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1239

a) The area immediately surrounding the rock structure is being heavily impacted by latrine use. One small latrine was found inside the rock structure. There is a well developed recreation trail leading to the site.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-1240

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1241

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1243

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1244

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1246

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1247

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-1248

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1249

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-IH-1250

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1256

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1257

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1258

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1259

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1260

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1261

a) High flood waters have deposited and shifted sand making the site unlocatable at this time.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-IH-1262

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1263

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1264

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1265

a) One firering was noted on the site. The level area has been used by campers.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1266

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1269

a) High water impacted the site exposing more artifacts. Surface erosion continues on the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1272

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1275

a) No change in condition. Several firerings were noted in the area but they did not impact the site.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1301

a) The high water deposited sand over part of the site in the spring. During the summer the site was vandalized.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-IH-1302

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every five years.

10-IH-1308

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1312

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1314

a) A firering and vehicle traffic are impacting the site.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-IH-1328

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every three years.

10-IH-1329

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-LE-18

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-LE-19

a) No major change in condition. The high water covered the site but apparently did not impact it.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-LE-22

a) No change in condition. The high water covered the site but apparently did not impact it.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-LE-47

a) Trail use continues from livestock and recreation users. High water has impacted the site also.

b) Monitor twice every year.

10-LE-50

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-NP-113

a) No change in condition. Some livestock use was noted on the site.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-NP-116

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-117

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-119

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-NP-120

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-NP-122

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-123

a) The high water impacted the site exposing some artifacts.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-NP-124

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-125

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-128

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-224

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-NP-227

a) The high water covered the site.

b) Monitor once every six years.

10-NP-229

a) The high water has shifted sand around the site covering part of the site.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-230

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-NP-231

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-232

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every two years.

10-NP-233

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every four years.

10-NP-234

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-235

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every year.

10-NP-236

a) No change in condition.

b) Monitor once every six years.

FY 1988 Implementation Plan

Implementation of the CRMP in FY88 should follow the guidelines established in the CRMP. General management actions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 23, 24, and 25 should continue to be implemented as planned at the funding level outlined in the CRMP.

The following site-specific management actions should be implemented. Other site-specific actions may be added after completion of the FY87 monitoring program.

10-IH-750

a) The site continues to be impacted by high water and recreation use.

b) Recommendations:

   1. Set a project post.
   2. Collect diagnostic surface artifacts.
   3. Complete architectural recording of the rock structures.
   4. Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1180

a) Recreation use is still heavy in the area.

b) Recommendations:

   1. Set a project post for future mapping purposes.
   2. Complete architectural recording of the structure.
   3. Monitor once every year.

10-IH-1186

a) Recreation use appears to be increasing in the area.

b) Recommendations:

   1. Complete a detailed inventory of surface artifacts.
   2. Prepare a feature map indicating concentrations of artifacts.
   3. Set a project post.

10-IH-1209

a) Recreation use is increasing in the area of the site. No recent direct recreation impacts have been observed.

b) Recommendations:

1. Set a project post.
2. Complete architectural recording of the site.
3. Collect any diagnostic surface artifacts.
4. Monitor once every year.

BLM LIBRARY
BLDG 50, ST-150A
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 25047
DENVER, COLORADO 80225